

西北大学

硕士学位论文

翻译标准多元与互补——圣经汉译翻译理论与展望

姓名：慕玮

申请学位级别：硕士

专业：英语语言文学

指导教师：胡宗锋

20090612

摘要

《圣经》是人类历史上流传最为广泛的一部书籍。它的影响力远远超出了犹太教及基督教的范围之内。文学、艺术，尤其是西方文化都受到了《圣经》思想与基调及熏陶。同样，圣经的翻译活动也为文学及语言的发展带来了深远的影响。

由于存在多种不同版本的《圣经》，出现了新的译本与其他译本之间关于翻译标准的争论。每个译者都尝试如何使译本更精确的表达出原文所要表达的字义或语义，但这是一个无法逾越的高度。尤其在近几年，随着译本的不断更新，想要得出哪个译本更精确或更易理解这一结论并非易事。很多读者、学者及教徒都对是否只选用一种译本或只用一种翻译理论译经争论不休。不能否认的是，主张只用“形式对应”或“功能对等”等某一种翻译手段作为译经的唯一标准的直译或意译无疑会影响人们对圣经原文的正确理解。因为不论是功能对等还是形式对应，这两个标准都在侧重某一方面的时候忽视另一方面，优势与劣势并存。本文主张译者应当充分认识到每种翻译标准的不足之处，只采用单一翻译标准翻译圣经是不可取的。

基于上述问题的存在，本文在辜正坤教授提出的翻译标准多元互补理论的基础上尝试用一种新的视角来评估《圣经》汉译。借助对《圣经》和合本、现代中文译本及圣经新译本的翻译标准对比研究，分析例证，认为无论是“形式对应”或是“动态对等”在指导翻译活动时都有各自的局限性。而翻译标准多元互补理论，作为一个比较完整及全面的体系，对于指导《圣经》汉译具有可行性。翻译标准多元互补的理论框架，完整系统是：绝对标准——最高标准——具体标准。该理论肯定了原作的主导地位，同时又强调了具体标准的多样性。这一理论是对其他具体理论的高度概括与肯定，并打破了长久以来翻译标准一元论的僵局。翻译标准多元互补理论在传统译论的基础上建立了一种全新的翻译架构。无论对于翻译标准还是翻译实践都有重要的指导意义。

随着时代的进步，翻译标准一元论已经逐渐开始失去其主导地位，而翻译标准多元互补理论的提出对于中国翻译理论的发展及翻译实践的进步带来了新的方向和新的思想。

关键词：《圣经》汉译；翻译标准多元互补理论；和合本；当代中文译本

Abstract

The Bible is the most widely distributed book in human history. Moreover, in all its forms, the Bible has been enormously influential not only in Judaism but also in Christianity. The literature, art, and western culture, in particular, are deeply indebted to biblical themes and motifs. Translations of the Bible not only influenced literature but also shaped the development of languages.

The various Chinese Bible translations reflect differing views of the Bible, and invariably a new translation produces controversy within different translation criteria. It is hard for translators to attempt to capture the accurate words and meaning of the original language in the scriptures which all translations attempt to capture. With so many updates to translations over the years, it is hard to compare the translations for accuracy and ease of understanding. There are many readers, scholars, and Christians who argue the need to pick one translation and use only one translation. However, translations that claim to use only one approach such as the “formal equivalence” and the “dynamic equivalence” can’t avoid some sayings translated literally or freely, which will cause misunderstanding or will be misleading. It is important to realize that every translation approach involves highlighting some aspects of the original and ignoring others.

This dissertation is based upon the mutual research between the translation theory and Chinese Bible translation case study. The multiplicity and complementarities of translation criteria proposed by Professor Gu Zhengkun in 1980s demonstrate that there may be deficiency in a translation, and to advocate the use of only one translation approach is inappropriate. By advocating the multiplicity and complementary of translation criteria, he has not only broken the stereotype of the monism of traditional translation standard, but also demolished the traditional illusion of establishing a unique translation standard that can evaluate all translated criteria and guide all translation practice.

To worship a unitary translation standard is no longer true in current translation studies, and it is regarded as an notion of illusion that a unique translation standard can guide all the

translation practice. This criterion is important to Chinese Bible translation studies and practices because it has brought a new idea to Chinese translation theory circle.

Key words: Chinese Bible Translation; Multiplicity and Complementary of Translation Criteria; CUV; TCV; NCV

西北大学学位论文知识产权声明书

本人完全了解西北大学关于收集、保存、使用学位论文的规定。学校有权保留并向国家有关部门或机构送交论文的复印件和电子版。本人允许论文被查阅和借阅。本人授权西北大学可以将本学位论文的全部或部分内容编入有关数据库进行检索，可以采用影印、缩印或扫描等复制手段保存和汇编本学位论文。同时授权中国科学技术信息研究所等机构将本学位论文收录到《中国学位论文全文数据库》或其它相关数据库。

保密论文待解密后适用本声明。

学位论文作者签名： 慕坤 指导教师签名： 胡宗锋

2009年6月12日 2009年6月12日

西北大学学位论文独创性声明

本人声明：所呈交的学位论文是本人在导师指导下进行的研究工作及取得的研究成果。据我所知，除了文中特别加以标注和致谢的地方外，本论文不包含其他人已经发表或撰写过的研究成果，也不包含为获得西北大学或其它教育机构的学位或证书而使用过的材料。与我一同工作的同志对本研究所做的任何贡献均已在论文中作了明确的说明并表示谢意。

学位论文作者签名： 慕坤

2009年6月

Acknowledgements

Without the help, advice, and encouragement of many individuals, this dissertation would have never been completed.

I have been truly blessed by having one of the most encouraging advisors a student could be fortunate enough to study under, my respected academic advisor, Prof. Hu Zongfeng. I thank him for the many years of both support and advice. I have benefited not only from his knowledge, but also his generous contribution of reference books, without which it is impossible for this dissertation to be what it is now.

I also record my gratitude to Prof. Gan Shian, Prof. Ban Rongxue and other teachers, who have taught me a great deal in my postgraduate study in Northwest University. Their profound knowledge is and will forever remain an inexhaustible source of my inspiration.

I also want to thank my dear aunt, Dr. Xiao Wang of the English Department of Broward College in Florida, for her love, kindness, patience, and support during my schooling and for helping me revise my dissertation drafts with valuable suggestions.

In addition, I'd like to express my sincere thanks to my close friends, Chen QI, Pu Yunli, Li Ying, Liang Chao and Ren Kai who gave me much advice and encouragement.

Last, but not the least, my family certainly made the greatest contribution to this dissertation. Their love, support and encouragement over so many years has really helped to shape my future. I thank my parents for their love and patience. I am also thankful for the tremendous love and all the encouragement from my grandparents over the years.

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Research Background and Purpose

Chinese Bible translation history lasted over 1300 years. However, there is no theory of translation in the technical sense of “accurate equivalence”, save for a few theories in the broad sense of “a set of principles which are helpful in understanding the nature of translation or in establishing criteria for evaluating a translated text”(Eugene •A •Nida, 2001, P.114). That is to say, in China, there are two factors resulting in this kind of situation. First, many Chinese scholars only study translation in the perspective of literature, culture, sociology, aesthetics, and literary criticism instead of a systematic study from the angle of pragmatics in translation. Secondly, they emphasize the evaluation of translation versions rather than the translation theories.

Throughout Chinese Bible translation history, two major translation approaches have been used: dynamic equivalence translation and formal equivalence translation (similar to literal translation). Many readers and scholars argue the need to pick one translation and use only one translation approach. In my opinion, it is useful to know where there may be a deficiency in a translation, and to advocate the use of only one translation is inappropriate. We can't put all our trust in just one translation criterion. It is important to realize that both functional and formal equivalence involve highlighting some aspects of the original and downplaying or ignoring others. The multiplicity and complementarity criteria make up for the defect. This theory consists of three criteria: the absolute criterion, the highest criterion, and the concrete criterion. The absolute standard actually refers to the source text itself, because without source texts, there would be no translated works. The absolute standard is inaccessible, because if we say someone has reached this standard, it means he or she did not translate any word at all, for no translation can be done without changing a single word.

However, the absolute standard is indispensable due to its inherent relationship with the other two standards. Without it, the whole standard system will be incomplete. We can only pursue the highest standard during the process of translation since the absolute standard is inaccessible. The highest standard refers to the optimum closeness to the original text, or, “in the course of our translation, we should try to imitate the content and the form (i.e. the deep structure and the surface structure) of the original text” (辜正坤, 2004:49). In fact, as we have stated above, the highest standard actually means “faithfulness and “equivalence”. However, the highest standard is just too immeasurable, and as a translation standard, it is still inapplicable. Therefore, a series of concrete standards are essential to judge the optimum closeness of translated works. Thus a hierarchy of the translation standard system is built.

This dissertation attempts to analyze the different versions of the Chinese Bible translation and explain how the translators work when interpreting source language and reproducing the target language under the multiplicity and complementarity of translation criteria.

The purpose of this dissertation is to apply the multiplicity of translation criteria to bring a new idea to Chinese translation theory circle, that is, to worship a unitary translation standard is no longer true in current translation studies, and it is regarded as a notion of illusion that a unique translation standard can guide all the translation practice.

However, this attempt needs more refinements and further improvements.

1.2 The Structure of the Study

This dissertation consists of five chapters.

The first chapter aims to provide a general introduction of the background, purpose, and structure of this dissertation. This research discusses the findings and limitations of the major Chinese Bible versions and restates that the translator should find a balance between the “formal equivalence” and “dynamic equivalence” under the guidance of the “multiplicity and complementarity of translation criteria”.

The second chapter introduces the Bible and outlines the history of the Bible translation in China and in the world.

The third chapter gives a detailed explanation about the definition of translation and related theories--formal equivalence, dynamic equivalence and a new theoretical approach--the multiplicity and complementarity of translation criteria.

The fourth chapter focuses on the analysis of different Chinese Bible translations, contrast two basic approaches used in these translations, and propose the design to reconstruct the Chinese Bible translation theory on the basis of the "multiplicity of translation theory".

The last chapter summarizes the findings of the analyses and proposes theoretical recommendations for future Bible translation.

Chapter 2

A Survey of Chinese Bible Translation

2.1 The Introduction of the Bible

The word Bible comes from the Latin and Greek words, meaning “book”. Unlike any other books ever written, the Bible is compiled of writings that cover a span of about 1400 years in three different languages (Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek) by about forty writers. The Bible contains many different styles of writing. The Bible includes books of law such as Leviticus and Deuteronomy, historical books such as Ezra and Acts, books of poetry such as Psalms and Ecclesiastes, books of prophecy such as Isaiah and Revelation, biographies such as Matthew and John, and formal letters such as Titus and Hebrews.

Sixty-six different books are arranged in the Old Testament and New Testament. The Old Testament contains 39 books written from approximately 1500 to 400 BC, which consists of basic sections such as Law, History, Poetry and Prophecy. The New Testament contains 27 books written from approximately 40 to 90 AD, which consists of four classes of literature--Gospels, History, Correspondence and Apocalyptic.

It is commonly known that the Bible in its hundreds of different translations is the most widely distributed book in human history. In all its forms, the Bible has been enormously influential in Judaism and Christianity. Moreover, the literature, art, and music of western culture in particular are deeply indebted to biblical themes, motifs, and images. Translations of the Bible not only influenced literature but also shaped the development of languages.

2.2 The Introduction of Bible Translation in the World

The Bible has been translated into many languages from the biblical languages of Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek. The very first translation of the Hebrew Bible into Greek was

the Septuagint (LXX), which later became the accepted text of the Old Testament in the church. The Latin Vulgate by Jerome was based upon the Hebrew and Greek text. Christian translations also tend to be based upon the Hebrew. Bible translations incorporating modern textual criticism also take into account possible variants from all available ancient versions. The received text of the Christian New Testament is in Greek, and nearly all translations are based upon the Greek text.

The Latin Vulgate was dominant in Christianity through the Middle Ages. Since then, the Bible has been translated into many more languages. English Bible translations in particular have a rich and varied history of more than a millennium.

Partial translations of the Bible into languages of the English people can be traced back to the end of the 7th century. The English Bible was first translated from the Latin Vulgate into Old English by a few monks and scholars. Such translations were generally in the form of prose or as literal translations above the Latin words. As time went on, however, English translations became more frequent into the evolving Middle English. All of the translations made the Bible more accessible to the public, both to those who were literate and through oral interpretation.

Despite differences between the Middle English Bible and more contemporary English versions of the Bible, the importance of the texts in both times should not be doubted. While literacy was more limited in the Middle Ages, the oral tradition, especially through the reading of scripture at Mass, was still very important. In fact, which scriptures would be read at what time of the year was largely shaped during this time period.

The general perspective on the Bible in the Middle Ages was somewhat different from contemporary views. For instance, very few complete translations existed during that time. Rather, most of the books of the Bible existed separately and were read as individual texts. Thus, the sense of the Bible as history that often exists today did not exist at that time. Instead, a more allegorical rendering of the Bible was more common, and translations of the Bible often included the writer's own commentary on passages in addition to the literal translation.

Early Modern English Bible translations are those translations of the Bible, which were published between about 1500 and 1800, the period of Early Modern English. This was the first major period of Bible translation into the English language. It began with the introduction of the Tyndale Bible and included the King James Version (1611). It included the first "authorized version", known as the Great Bible (1539); the Geneva Bible (1560) was notable for being the first Bible that was divided into verses.

Much like early English Bibles, which were based on Greek texts or Latin translations, modern English translations of the Bible are based on the most available original texts of the time. The translators put much scholarly effort into cross-checking the various sources such as the Septuagint, Textus Receptus, and Masoretic Text. Relatively recent discoveries such as the Dead Sea scrolls provide additional reference information. There is some controversy over which texts should be used as a basis for translation, as some of the alternate sources do not include verses which are found in the Textus Receptus. Some say that the alternate sources were poorly representative of the texts used in their time, whereas others claim that the Textus Receptus includes passages that were added to the alternate texts improperly. These controversial passages are generally not the basis for disputed issues of doctrine, but tend to be additional stories or phrases. The majority of modern English translations, such as the New International Version, contain extensive text notes indicating where differences occur in original sources.

A variety of linguistic, philological and ideological approaches to translation have been used, including:

Dynamic equivalence translation

Formal equivalence translation (similar to literal translation)

Idiomatic, or Paraphrastic translation, as used by the late Kenneth N. Taylor

A great deal of debate occurs over which approach most accurately communicates the message of the biblical languages' source texts into target languages. Despite these debates, however, many who study the Bible intellectually or devotionally find that selecting more than one translation approach is useful in interpreting and applying what they read. For

example, a very literal translation may be useful for individual word or topical study, while a paraphrase may be employed for grasping initial meaning of a passage.

2.3 An Outline of the Bible Translation History in China

The earliest record about a Chinese translation of the Bible is found on a stone stele dating back to seventh century C.E. A reliable source that can support the evidence of the introduction of the Christian faith is the Nestorian Stele from the eighth century. The Chinese name of the stele is formally translated as “the Memorial of the Propagation in China of the Luminous Religion from Daqin” (大秦景教中国流行碑, Daqin being the Chinese term for the Roman Empire). Among the characters on the stele, we find Chinese expressions such as “real canon” and “translating the Bible”. So far, however, no preserved Bible translations of this period as mentioned in the stele are to be found. Based on the information found in a Nestorian Church canon Zunjing discovered at Dunhuang in 1907-1908, translated books from the Bible were Genesis, Exodus, the book of Psalms, the book of Zechariah, and the book of Hosea, among others.

The second earliest recorded translation of the Bible in China, to be dated to late thirteenth century to early fourteenth century, was by Father John of Montecorvino. The target language of translation is Mongolian, not exactly Chinese.

The famous Jesuit Matteo Ricci also attempted translating the Bible in the late sixteenth century. However, the only record preserved down to today is his rendering of the Ten Commandments in Chinese. There is no evidence that he made the effort of translating the whole Hebrew Bible; many clues point in the direction that only sections very useful for his missionary activities were translated into Chinese.

During late eighteenth century, Jesuit Louis de Poirot translated almost all the books of the Bible to Chinese. However, the translation was based on the Vulgate, was never published.

In 1807 Robert Morrison, in cooperation with W. C. Milne, finished translating several books of the Bible into Chinese. In 1819 Morrison finished the rest of the Bible by himself.

The English Baptist missionary and a scholar in oriental studies, Joshua Marshman

(1768-1837), translated the book of Genesis into Chinese, together with several New Testament books. These were published in 1822.

In 1840, a group of four people (Walter Henry Medhurst, Charles Gutzlaff, E. C. Bridgman, and John R. Morrison) translated the Bible collaboratively. The translation of the Bible part was done mostly by Gutzlaff from the Netherlands Missionary Society, with the exception that the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua were done by the group collectively. This translation is very famous due to its adoption by the revolutionary peasant leader, Hong Xiuquan of the Taipingtianguo movement as the doctrines of the organization. Hong renamed the book slightly and added notations in many places to fit the needs of the movement.

In 1854, a new translation of the Hebrew Bible, prepared by Walter Henry Medhurst with the help of the Sinologist James Legge, was published. The translation was initiated by a missionary commission yet turned out to be a translation by a few people, due to separation into different sections because of theological differences. The translation was considered excellent Chinese writing, and it used plenty of Chinese philosophical terms, sacrificing accuracy based on the original Hebrew texts.

In 1862, the American Protestant missionary, E. C. Bridgman (1801-1861), published a translation of the Bible, characterized by the accuracy of the translation and its loyalty to the original Hebrew texts.

J. T. Goddard published his reedited and retranslated Hebrew Bible in Chinese in 1868. It is considered an excellent combination and compromise in style between Bridgman's and Medhurst's translations because it is both elegant from the perspective of Chinese readers and accurate with respect to the original texts.

The Jewish Episcopal Bishop S. I. J. Schereschewsky (1831-1906) published a northern vernacular Chinese translation of the Hebrew Bible in 1875, and later a second edition in 1902.

The second edition was written with only two fingers due to his illness and is thus known as the "two finger edition". Schereschewsky's translation was the most popular translation for over twenty years before the Union Version was published.

The most famous Chinese translation of the Hebrew Bible is the Chinese Union Version (CUV). It was so named as a reflection of the fact that translators from all the major denominations of the time came together and worked in cooperation with each other in order to complete work. This translation was commissioned by the Shanghai Missionary Society in 1890 and completed in 1919 by a sixteen-member committee of foreign missionaries, with the aid of several Chinese believers to check the accuracy of the language used. Translators of the Hebrew Bible part were selected Bible experts who were also missionaries. They were C. W. Mateer from the Presbyterian Church in U.S.A., G. C. Goodrich Owen and S. Lewis from the American Methodist Episcopal Church, from the American Congregationalist, and F. W. Baller from the China Inland Mission. The translation effort for the Hebrew part of the Bible lasted almost thirteen years, with the books of Job and Psalms finished first and the complete Bible finished in 1919.

An Italian Franciscan Friar, Gabriele Allegra, who died in 1976, began a Chinese Bible translation in 1935 and later founded the Studium Biblicum to accomplish his work. This translation was done directly from the original Bible, and the process was well documented. The Chinese translation of the Bible was published in 1954 in Hong Kong. In 1968, a revised version of the Chinese translation was published in combination with the recently finished New Testament translation. In 1992, this version was once again published, but for the first time in Mainland China.

The translation emphasizes accuracy over elegance. It made every effort to convey the original meanings of the scriptures, and the translators had received the most advanced biblical scholarship training of the time. Another outstanding feature of this translation is the introduction added in front of every book and the detailed summary and endnotes added after each book. It attempts not only to reflect the latest scholarship of biblical studies of the time in its notes and introductions, but also adds explanatory notes and quotations from traditional Chinese sources in order to elucidate the Hebrew texts. Every introduction by itself is a valuable scholarly article about the book. Due to the large amount of information added to the translation of the original texts, single volumes of each book with full notations targeting advanced readers were published in addition to the one volume edition with abridged notations.

The appendices of the single volume copies are also very useful.

This Chinese Bible has become the standard text for Chinese Catholics worldwide, including those within China.

Another translation done by Lv Zhenzhong was published in 1970. He began his translation as a scholar at Yanjing University in 1940 and completed the full translation thirty years later. Working only from original Bible texts, this translation uses the so-called “direct translation” method, with exact one-to-one correspondences to the original Bible, reflecting the original meaning and content of each word and even keeping to the original grammar and structures. In this manner, some problems that are faced in the Union Version are avoided in the Lv translation.

The center of Christianity developed from the mainland to Taiwan after the Communist party gained control over Mainland China in 1949. Therefore, Taiwan’s effort in translating the Bible into Chinese reflects the best level of translation in China. Under the guidelines of the United Bible Societies, started in Taiwan in 1971, the translators took Today’s English Version as its blueprint, which was accordingly named Today’s Chinese Version (TCV). TCV was published by the United Bible Societies in 1979.

This version used the principle of so-called “Functional equivalence” during the translation, which endeavored to convey to the Chinese readers what the Bible authors originally intended to express to the original Bible readers or listeners. In order to achieve this goal, free translations were used more extensively. The translators had in mind average people who had junior middle school education as the majority of the readers. “It avoids using any theological jargon, and the translation does not have an exact word-to-word correspondence with the original texts. Nevertheless, the basic meaning is the same, but in a much more natural and easier-to-follow style.” Illustrations were inserted into the TCV. Footnotes were added into each page. A second edition of the TCV came out in 1984, and was reprinted twenty times. A revised version appeared in 1995, making reference to original Hebrew and Greek texts during the revision.

In 1976, with the sponsorship of the Lockman Foundation from California, U.S.A., an

initiative to produce a so-called “New Chinese Translation” was announced. The Bible part of the “New Chinese Translation” started in the same year. The effort lasted over ten years and did not turn out to be very successful due to the quality of the translation or lack of propaganda or both.

In 1992, the Commission for Chinese Bible Translation Cooperation was established in order to translate the Bible from Hebrew directly to Chinese. The translation is to be named the “New Union Bible Translation.” The Bible text to be used is *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. So far this effort has produced no result. One of the main reasons for the slow progress is the internal conflicts between Catholic and other Christian translators on the commission regarding the religious terms to be used in the new translation.

2.4 Translation based on the Bible's command

In the Great Commission Jesus instructs the disciples to "make disciples of all nations, ... teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you" (Matt. 28:19-20 NIV). This implies that Jesus' teaching will spread among the nations and will be understood and obeyed. But that means that his teaching has to become available to these nations and they speak thousands of different languages. Therefore, when Jesus gave the Great Commission it implied that his followers eventually would have to translate his teaching into many different languages. Translation of Jesus' teaching (and, by implication, the message of the whole Bible) plays a part in the total process of fulfilling the Great Commission.

Acts 2 points to the same conclusion. On the Day of Pentecost the Holy Spirit gave the gift of tongues to the disciples, enabling them miraculously to speak the message in other languages. On that day, the day when the Gospel began to go to all nations, an amazing miracle from God hinted that translation into other languages (but not necessarily miraculous translation!) would be a part of spreading the Gospel message.

But "making disciples" does not mean merely translating the Bible and then throwing the completed version at some prospective disciple. We need to include evangelism and a process

of growth that involves much teaching (Eph. 4:11; 1 Cor. 12:28). A translation of the Bible lies at the base of this process, but afterwards the teaching is built upon the translation.

The Bible defines our goal. But what difficulties confront translators in practice?

2.41 Difficulties in translating

To appreciate some of the difficulties, we need to take a look at the actual process of translation, and at the human languages with which a translator works. God gave us language as one of his greatest gifts. But it is not only a great gift -- it is an exceedingly rich and complex gift. That very richness makes translation a challenging operation.

1. Words take different meanings

A single word like "dog" or "trunk" in English reveals vast complexity. One dictionary lists no less than four distinct words "dog." It has only one entry for "trunk," but six distinct senses listed under it. 1 How do we decide among these senses?

Native speakers of English usually decide instantly and without effort which sense of a word is right. They use hints deriving from (i) the grammar (is the word a noun, a verb, a direct object, etc.? And what grammatical construction does it fit into?), (ii) the relationship to the larger context -- that is, the other words, sentences, paragraphs, and the whole communication ("discourse") and (iii) the situation (about what circumstances is the speaker talking, and what does he expect us to do in response?). These three factors can be called the grammatical context, the discourse context, and the situational context. They reveal which of several senses of a word the speaker is using.

But occasionally there are ambiguities. At times it is a challenge to know which sense of a word a speaker is using. In fact, when breakdowns in communication occur, it is often because two people are using the same word in different ways.

When we try to translate between two languages, the challenges become even greater. Suppose that we are translating the Old Testament from Hebrew to English. We must deal with the dictionary definitions for both Hebrew and English words. Though two words from the two languages may roughly correspond in meaning (Hebrew *ben* and English "son," for example), they seldom match exactly.

In many cases, because a word has several different possible meanings, no one word in English may match all the uses in another language.

2. Sentence formation differs from language to language

In translation we also must deal with the meaning of whole phrases, sentences, and paragraphs, not simply isolated words. Each word in a sentence contributes to the meaning. But we want to translate the message, the meaning of the whole, not simply words in isolation. Translators must take into account the many ways in which word meanings interact when they occur in discourse.

We find, for example, that languages differ in the way they put words and sentences together. Greek may use long sentences: Ephesians 1:3-14 is one sentence in Greek. Current English style prefers shorter sentences. Hebrew sentences tend to be shorter still.

The normal order of words in a sentence may differ between languages.

We find also that grammatical features in one language do not match those in another language in a one-to-one fashion.

3. Form and meaning

The naive person may think, "Just translate by putting in equivalent words, one by one." But as we have seen, such a procedure often does not adequately capture the meaning of the original. In fact, translators want to express the same meaning in English as was expressed in the original. To achieve this goal, they find that many times they must not simply translate mechanically, word for word. That is, they do not preserve form. A single word in Hebrew (like *ruach*, "breath, wind, spirit") is not always translated the same way in English. A single grammatical tense (like the Greek aorist) is not always translated the same way. A single construction (like the Greek conjunction *hina*) is not always translated the same way. The translator alters these forms in English, precisely in order to express the fullest possible meaning most accurately in English.

This kind of flexibility in translation is not always easy for beginners to achieve. Hence, teachers of translation summarize it in a simple way: "translate meaning, not form."

Naive Bible students can easily make a mistake here. They believe, rightly, that every detail in the message of original manuscripts, including every individual word, was breathed out by God (2 Tim. 3:16). But then they may wrongly infer that a translation must proceed on a strict, mechanical, word-for-word basis. Such reasoning does not recognize that in the original languages, God himself combined the words into sentences in order to convey a message. We do not do justice to God's speech unless we recognize that he spoke the words in sentences and paragraphs, not in isolation. Faithfully rendering his speech in another language means attending all aspects of God's speech, not just the words in isolation. When we read a letter to a friend, we read the message using the words. Just so when we read God's Word, the Bible.

Chapter 3

The Related Theories

3.1 What Is Translation

In any form of interlingual communication, translation is used as a generic term. Professionally, however, the term "translation" is confined to the written, and the term interpretation, to the spoken. If confined to a written language, translation is a cover term with three distinguishable meanings as follows:

- 1) translating, the process (to translate; the activity rather than the tangible object)
- 2) a translation: the product of the process of translating (e.g. the translated text)
- 3) translation: the abstract concept which encompasses both the process of translating and the product of that process.

Translation of a large number of research scholars talked to almost all of its framework concept. If Tam Hei contained in the translation of "ordinary Translation", "special Translation" and "Application of Translation Studies" in three parts; Gimje credit for the translation of basic theory of translation, translation Ontology theory, translation studies specific research and translation skills; Yang Zijian that includes the translation of works of translation, translation arts and translation; Liu Mi-translation of the concept into the framework of the "internal" and "external systems" in two parts. Shou-Yi Fan translation studies can be considered "basic theory," and "skills" and "multi-angle study" constitutes. Prince made by the translation of "ordinary translation studies, involving two specific description language and translation studies involving two specific language translation of the application" constitutes. (TAM contained joy, 1991:283) with Holmes's "description translation studies, translation theory and application of translation theory," we can see that this concept several scholars in the translation

of the framework, though inconsistent with the terms, But without exception, will be part of theory and application of the other. In their view, the theory is the core of the whole structure, with a high degree of abstraction, from the practice part of the specific guidance of practical activities are part of application (or application of translation studies, translation works, external systems, applications, techniques, applications Translation theory). Yang Zijian (2000) said, "a mature discipline is an important symbol of the theory and application boundaries clear, self-made systems, and other disciplines can provide theoretical and methodological." The problem is that our current theory and application boundaries blurred, Some people will often confused with theory and application, see the role of theory, which leads to the "theory of useless." At present, our theoretical study is not too much, but theoretical research is still far from enough, the theory of abstract summarized a lot worse. Holmes also said, "translation between the various branches of the lack of a clear boundary in this area is hampered research and development of the major obstacles." (Weissbrod, 1998) Yang Zijian (2000), "said abstract theoretical core of high-independence is the subject of an independent status symbol." For the early completion of translation studies, we also must vigorously strengthen its description and research.

The term 'translation' used and discussed throughout this dissertation is confined to the written language, and refers to both the product and process of translating. Translation consists of studying the lexicon, grammatical structure, and cultural context of the source language text, analyzing it in order to determine its meaning, and then reconstructing this same meaning using the lexicon and grammatical structure which are appropriate in the receptor language and its cultural context.

The translator has the job of taking a message formed in one culture and producing a message that is understandable to members of another culture. The ideal translation will be accurate as to meaning and natural as to the receptor language forms used, but such results are not always possible. Some factors affecting the accurate of the translation include the knowledge of the translator, the knowledge of the receiver, and the distance between the two cultures in terms of common experiences.

3.2 Equivalence in Translation

The definitions of translation suggested above imply that producing the same meaning or message in the target language text as intended by the original author is the main objective of a translator. The target text can never be equivalent to the source text at all levels. Researchers have distinguished different types of equivalence. This equivalence relation is generally considered the most salient feature of a quality translation. Eugene A. Nida proposed two translation methods in the context of Bible translation: the "formal equivalence" and "dynamic equivalence" or "functional equivalence". These two approaches are quite distinct from each other. Formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence methods represent two opposite poles in a clash. Nida's theory has great influence on Chinese translation scholars.

The terms "dynamic equivalence" and "formal equivalence" were originally coined to describe ways of translating the Bible, but the two approaches are applicable to any translation.

Dr. Nida Western linguistics translation theory is representative of one school, after 50 years of translation theory and practice study, and achieved fruitful results. So far he has published more than 40 monographs, more than 250 papers. Since the early 1980s Nida's theory has been introduced into China, has now become a modern Western theory was introduced at the earliest, largest, most influential theory. "His achievement lies in: 1, the Information and symbols of the introduction of translation theory, the 'Dynamic equivalence' translation standards; 2, the modern linguistics application of the latest research results to the theory of translation; 3, in the translation a history of the social benefits (readers) principles into standards of the translation. "

(LAU week, Luoping ,1999:32-33), especially his theories on the dynamic, and in breaking the traditional Chinese translation of the static analysis of the situation of translation standards, open to the translation of the theoretical principles, we have established new Theory can be found in the right direction. Translation Theory domestic numerous researchers and teachers of translation enthusiasm, a Chinese translation of "adhere Nida situation." Nida's enough to show that these phenomena in China's translation industry in the position.

I Nida their theory was constantly revised and development, linguistics from the stage to describe communication theory stage, further development of the social semiotic stage. On the theory of revising and depth, this is a theoretical study of an inevitable road. However, careful analysis we can see that the Nida is the most fundamental change in the treatment of the translation of attitude. 1964 Nida, in his book "Toward a Science of Translating" in a clear-cut manner, used the banner of scientific translation in 1974, "translation theory and practice" that "far translation is not only a scientific but also a technology, ideal and the real translation is in the final analysis an art"; 1991, "may be impossible to translate the "article said," We should not be translated into a scientific..... most notable achievements, and creative spirit of the few translators, or simply do not need translation theory..... " "And a translation Nida writing" (see Zhang Jing-hao, "Chinese translation of the" 2000 No. 5, hereinafter referred to as "writing", Nida officially announced that "my point of view has been a fundamental change"

In such circumstances, the Nida changes in the thinking of a detailed analysis to identify Nida I give up a translation of scientific theory and the reasons for the imminent otherwise, we translation studies and academic building work is equivalent to the backyard on fire, its own chaos disarray. Originally translation of such a work should be respected industry veteran to do, but I can not wait to talk about their own views, and hope to clarify some misconceptions about the present, the translation industry also urge you criticize predecessors correction.

3.2.1. Formal Equivalence

The concept "formal equivalence" means translated the source language directly into the target language and focus on the expression of the original or source language. It focuses attention on the message itself in both form and content. Formal equivalence requires that the message in the target language should match as closely as possible the different elements in the source language. .

Completely unambiguous formal translation of larger works is more goal than reality if only one language may contain a word for a concept that has no direct equivalent in another language. In other words, a neologism may be created by borrowing a word from the source language in the target language to represent the concept.

3.2.2. Dynamic Equivalence

Dynamic equivalence, which is based on the principle of equivalent effect, sometimes called functional equivalence or thought-by-thought translation. The relationship between the receptor and message should be substantially the same as existed between the original receptors and the message. The translator must attempt to reflect the thought of the writer in the source language rather than the words and forms. The translator will read a sentence or other unit of thought, try to understand it as well as possible, and then write that thought in the target language. The forms of the source language are not important, because dynamic equivalence eschews strict adherence to the original text in favor of a more natural rendering in the target language. It is sometimes used when the readability of the translation is more important than the preservation of the original wording. Thus a novel might be translated with greater use of dynamic equivalence so that it may read well, while in diplomacy the precise original meaning may be the uppermost consideration.

Many readers and scholars argue the need to pick one translation and use only one translation approach. In my opinion, it is useful to know that there may be deficiency in a translation and that it is inappropriate to advocate the use of only one translation. We can't rely on just one translation criterion. It is important to realize that both functional and formal equivalence involve highlighting some aspects of the original and downplaying or ignoring others. If we readers want to read a translation that preserves author's word order, we are going to lose his style. If we want a translation that always uses the same word to translate, we're going to lose the nuances of the original word in various contexts. If we want a translation that translates nouns as nouns and never makes their meaning clear by changing them into verbs, we're going to lose some of that meaning. There's no way to get the full meaning of the original unless one reads the original.

3.2.3 Problems of Equivalence

The principle that a translation should have an equivalence relation with the source language text is problematic. There are three main reasons why an exact equivalence or effect is difficult

to achieve. Firstly, it is impossible for a text to have constant interpretations even for the same person on two occasions (Hervey, Higgins and Haywood (1995: 14). According to these translation scholars: before one could objectively assess textual effects, one would need to have recourse to a fairly detailed and exact theory of psychological effect, a theory capable, among other things, of giving an account of the aesthetic sensations that are often paramount in response to a text (Hervey, Higgins and Haywood (1995: 14).

Secondly, translation is a matter of subjective interpretation of translators of the source language text. Thus, producing an objective effect on the target text readers, which is the same as that on the source text readers is an unrealistic expectation. Thirdly, it may not be possible for translators to determine how audiences responded to the source text when it was first produced (*ibid*, p. 14). Miao (2000) gives a specific example of the impossibility of the equivalence relation:

If an original was written centuries ago and the language of the original is difficult to comprehend for modern readers, then a simplified translation may well have greater impact on its readers than the original had on the readers in the source culture. No translator would hinder the reader's comprehension by using absolute expressions in order to achieve equivalent effect (Miao, 2000: 202)

Because the target text can never be equivalent to the source text at all levels, researchers have distinguished different types of equivalence (Lauscher, 2000: 151). Nida (1964) suggests formal and dynamic or functional equivalence. Formal equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content. It requires that the message in the target language should match as closely as possible the different elements in the source language (p.159). Dynamic equivalence is based on the principle of equivalent effect, where the relationship between the receptor and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message (p. 159). Newmark (1981) makes a distinction between communicative and semantic translation. Like Nida's dynamic equivalence, communicative translation also tries to create the effect on the target text reader which is the

same as that received by readers of the source language text. Koller (1997) proposes denotative, connotative, pragmatic, textual, formal and aesthetic equivalence.

3.3 The Multiplicity and Complementarity of Translation Criteria

In conclusion, there is no unique and eternal translation standard that can evaluate all translated works and guide all translation practice, and translation standard should be multiple due to the objective reality.

The “multiplicity and complementarity of translation criteria” was first proposed by Professor Gu Zhengkun in the 1980s. Professor Gu formulated his translation theory by taking a dialectical and multi-epistemological viewpoints. By advocating the multiplicity of translation standard, he has not only broken away from the stereotypical monism of traditional translation standard, but also demolished the traditional illusion of establishing a unique translation standard that can evaluate all translated works and guide all translation practice eternally. Professor Gu primarily points out that the reason we can't reach agreement on the problem of translation criterion is that our way of thinking is indirectional or directional. People are used to adopting formative logic reasoning and saying there is only one road, one answer. To solve the problem, we should part with the traditional way of thinking and replace it with the three-dimensional mode of thinking.

Professor Gu classifies translation standard into three categories: the absolute criterion, the highest criterion, and the concrete criterion. Among these categories, absolute standard refers to the source text. The absolute standard is indispensable in the whole standard system, but it exists in name only because we can never reach the absolute standard. It is impossible to establish an absolute, omnipotent criterion for translation because no translation can be done without changing a single word. However, the absolute standard is indispensable due to its inherent relationship with the other two standards. Without it, the whole standard system will be incomplete. We can only pursue the highest standard during the process of translation since the absolute standard is inaccessible. The highest standard refers to the optimum closeness to the original text, or, “in the course of our translation, we should try to imitate the content and the form (i.e. the deep structure and the surface structure) of the original

text.” (辜正坤, 2004:49) In fact, as we have stated above, the highest standard actually means “faithfulness and “equivalence”. We may find out this term is more accurate and objective than the other two. However, the highest standard is just too immeasurable, and as a translation standard, it is still inapplicable. Therefore, a series of concrete standards are essential to judge the optimum closeness of translated works, and we should be ready to accept those reasonable criteria.

This standard itself is very abstract, but it is of great importance to Chinese translation studies because it has brought a new idea to Chinese translation theory circle, that is, to worship a unitary translation standard is no longer true in current translation studies, and it is regarded as a notion of illusion that a unique translation standard can guide all the translation practice.

3.3.1. The Proposal of the Multiplicity of Translation Criteria in Recent Times

The translation study has been deepened in the recent 20 years. People’s knowledge about translation is enriched continuously. There are hundreds of definitions of translation, each possessing validity to a certain degree. In spite of that all makers of definitions tend to say something to the effect that translation, in essence, is an interlingual transfer, few realized that translation means far more than this. It is not merely an interlingual behavior; rather, it is as far as its essential nature is concerned, a matter—spirit communication closely related to many other disciplines. (GuZhengkun, 2003:311) In fact, it is unrealistic for any theory to “generalize all texts and become the omnipotent criterion for translation”, the traditional unitary criteria only adapt to a certain or some certain texts.

With the deepening of translation theoretical study, the translation criterion has transferred from the traditional unitary one to a multiple system. Professor Gu Zhengkun is the first in our country to propose “the multiplicity and complementarity of translation criterion” for translation criterion. In his paper, Gu primarily points out that the reason why we can’t reach agreement on the problem of translation criterion is that our way of thought is unidirectional or directional. People are used to adopting formative logic reasoning and saying

there is only one road, one answer, etc. That's why quite a lot of translators always seek in vain the unitary criterion for translation. To solve the problem, we should break through the traditional way of thought and replace it with the three-dimensional mode of thought. This new thinking mode is characterized by its emphasis on the spatial nature of thought and the function of thought subject. According to his theory, if we regard the target text as something fixed, the subjects of inspection from different angles or directions may get different impressions and evaluations. Hence, it is impossible to establish an absolute, omnipotent criterion for translation. However, he further explains that it does not mean there is no criterion. There does exist translation criterion, and more than one criterion. We should be ready to accept those reasonable criteria. Gu's viewpoint has received a great deal of response from the professionals in this field. Most people think the MTCT help to evaluate the target text from different dimensions and levels. Thus the translators, source text and target text readers are equally treated.

Chapter 4

An Analysis of Different Chinese Bible Translation

4.1 A Brief Introduction to the Major Chinese Bible Versions

These selections represent the two primary approaches to translation (formal equivalent and functional equivalent), as well as both older and more recent translations.

1. The Chinese Union Version (CUV)

It is regarded as the most elegant Chinese Bible from a literary perspective. The Bible translators use everyday spoken language instead of classical Chinese. They strive to be faithful to the original Bible, yet they still take Chinese elegance into consideration. Generally speaking, the translating principle of CUV is literally and formally orientated, which can be confirmed by the analysis of the verbal consistency, voice consistency, word class consistency and sentence length.

Ever since the CUV was approved as the official version by Protestant churches in the beginning of last century, it has been the most widely distributed and utilized Chinese translation of the Bible.

2. The Today's Chinese Version (TCV)

The Today's Chinese Version (TCV) was prompted by “the new theory of translating with its focus on communicating the message of the original” (Strandenaes, 1987:139). Translators took the Today's English Version as its blueprint, which was accordingly named The Today's Chinese Version. The translators used the principle of “dynamic equivalence” during the translation, aiming to convey to the Chinese readers what the Bible's authors originally

intended to express to the original Bible readers or listeners. The translators had in mind average people who had junior middle school education as the majority of the readers and avoided using any theological jargons, which made it more natural and easier to follow. Translators intended to prepare a version for seekers and new believers under two main principles: “corresponding meaning and equal effect” and “faithful to the original and faithful to the readers”.

3. The New Chinese Version (NCV)

The New Chinese Version is the representative of free translation. Its preface (The New Chinese Version, 1992) states: “Faithful translation means more than the word matching. The text is supposed to express the same meanings and take the same effect among the target language readers today as the original text among the source language readers thousands of years ago.” Here “faithfulness” is defined as the loyalty to the writers' ideas rather than the concordance of styles. The translators intended to give a version intelligible for both believers and nonbelievers with purposely avoidance of theological and Biblical terms and vocabularies.

4.2 Basic Approaches Used in the Making of Chinese Bible Translations.

The work of translating the Bible presents special difficulties. Since the Scriptures are a source of both information and inspiration, Bible translations must be accurate as well as felicitous. Such an ideal is, of course, virtually very hard to attain. Another problem is compounded by the diversity of theories of the translation process. Should the translation be literalistic or free? Basically, there are two competing approaches of translation.

The first approach focuses mostly on the original text or the source of the translation. This is called the literal or formal equivalence method of translation.

A formal equivalence translation seeks a word-for-word equivalency, trying also to retain the grammatical structure of the original insofar as the destination language will permit. This is the traditional method of translation and adopts the source message as its control and seeks to bring the contemporary reader back to that point. It seeks to help the reader identify himself with a person in the source-language context as fully as possible, teaching him the customs,

manner of thought, and means of expression of the earlier time.

Examples of the formal equivalence translation method are as follows:

The Chinese Union Version (CUV)

The New Chinese Version (NCV)

The second approach is more concerned with the target audience of the translation. This approach is sometimes called the dynamic equivalence or functional equivalence method of translation.

“Dynamic equivalence” is defined as “the quality of a translation in which the message of the original text has been so transported into the receptor language that the response of the receptor is essentially like that of the original receptors.” This approach aims to relate the text to the receptor as well as his/her modes of behavior relevant within the context of his/her own culture. This is a controlling factor called “the principle of equivalent effect.” With dynamic equivalence, comprehension of the patterns of the source-language culture is unnecessary. The prime concern given to effective communication by dynamic equivalence at the expense of the source is a vivid confirmation of shift in focus. For instance, The Today's Chinese Version (TCV) uses the dynamic equivalence method.

4.3 Evaluating These Approaches

4.3.1 The Formal Equivalence

Formal equivalence translations give as literal a translation of the original text as possible. Translators using this philosophy stay close to the originals, even preserving much of the original word order. Literal translations are an excellent resource for serious Bible study.

Advantage

The literal approach, some may argue, creates the least amount of “change” to the original wording. It is faithful to the original and somehow more holy. The following is a comparison of renderings between the Chinese Union Version and the Today's Chinese

Version:

1. And Joseph was brought down to Egypt; and Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh, captain of the guard, an Egyptian, bought him of the hands of the Ishmeelites, which had brought him down thither. (Genesis 39:1 KJV)

约瑟被带下埃及去。有一个埃及人，是法老的内臣，护卫长波提乏，从那些带下他来的以实玛利人手下买了他去。(创一 39:1 CUV)

2. And his master saw that the LORD was with him, and that the LORD made all that he did to prosper in his hand. (Genesis 39:3 KJV)

耶和华使他手里所办的尽都顺利。 (创一 39: 3 CUV)

3. And it came to pass, when she saw that he had left his garment in her hand, and was fled forth. (Genesis 39:12 KJV)

约瑟把衣裳丢在妇人手里。 (Genesis 39:12 KJV)

4. 起初上帝创造天地。地是空虚混沌，渊面黑暗。(创一：1, 2 CUV)

太初，上帝创造宇宙，大地混沌，没有秩序。怒涛澎湃的海洋，被黑暗笼罩着。(创一：1, 2 TCV)

5. 太初有道。道与上帝同在，道就是上帝。这道太初与上帝同在。(约一：1, 2 CUV)

宇宙被造以前，道已经存在；道与上帝同在，与上帝相同。在太初，道就与上帝同在。(约一：1, 2 TCV)

The Union translation took the Revised Version of 1885 in English as its original version.

The translators strove to achieve the following four criteria:

- (1) use everyday spoken language instead of classical or vernacular Chinese;
- (2) use simple language so that laymen could understand while listening in the church;
- (3) be faithful to the original Hebrew, yet still take Chinese elegance into consideration;
- (4) translate puns and wordplays literally, instead of giving out literary translations of the hidden meanings. Sometimes, a word in the original text may have no exact

correspondence in Chinese. In such instances, the Chinese translation is stretched slightly in order to capture and explain the meaning of the original word. Small dots are placed under any additional words to indicate that they are not part of the original text, but are merely used to provide a context and explanation to make the Chinese translation of the original word clear.

The Union translation has been a great success since its publication. It has been considered not only a popular book for believers and non-believers alike, but also an outstanding scholarly work.

Disadvantage

The problem with formal translations that attempt to maintain the metaphors, structures, and grammatical distinction of the original text is that the results can be obscure, awkward and misleading. At the same time, a given word may have a number of meanings, which is frequently impossible, and more frequently confusing, to attempt to translate a given English word with the same Chinese word in every case. Therefore, the disadvantage of formal translations is that they are harder to read. They depend upon the reader's getting information about idioms of the original language and cultural background for figurative speech. Formal translation might not produce the most natural Chinese. The common method to report a response to something in conversation in the Bible is the use of this idiom, "And he answered and said". If we want to say this in Chinese, we might say it more naturally as "耶稣回答" or "主说". The treatment of literary expressions enables the readers to successfully realize its goal in the modern society. The following table shows more examples.

RV	CUV
the tabernacle of the congregation	幕中
Speak unto	晓谕
from the going up to Akribbim, from the	从亚克拉浜坡，从西拉而上

rock, and upward	
they set on fire all the cities that they came to	并一切所遇见的，都用刀杀尽，又放火烧了一切城邑。

Without the access to such information, the reader may not understand what is being said just by reading the text. The literal translations force the reader to learn more about the cultural context of the text.

4.32 The Dynamic Equivalence

Because literal translations make it difficult for readers to understand, many have produced more readable Bibles using the dynamic equivalence philosophy. According to this view, it does not matter whether the grammar and word order of the original is preserved in Chinese so long as the meaning of the text is preserved. Preserving the meaning of the text frees up the translator to use better Chinese style and word choice, producing more readable translations.

Advantages

The dynamic equivalence clears up meaningless idiomatic expressions and adapts the message to modern terms readily understood. Thus, Dynamic equivalence assists the reader where the Formal equivalence approach is weak in that it uses modern spoken language instead of classical or vernacular Chinese. The following compares the renderings between the Chinese Union Version and the Today's Chinese Version:

1. 上帝爱世人，甚至将祂的独生子赐给他们，叫一切信他的，不至灭亡，反得永生。(约 3:16 CUV)

上帝那么爱世人，甚至赐下他的独子，使所有信他的人不灭亡，反得到永恒的生命。(约 3:16 TCV)

2. 当下希律暗暗的召了博士来，细问那星是什么时候出

现的。(申 28:49 CUV)

于是，希律暗地里召见从东方来的星象家，向他们查问那颗星出现的准确日子。(申 28:49 TCV)

The Bible was written centuries ago, and the language of the original is difficult to comprehend for modern readers; thus, a simplified translation may well have greater impact on its readers than the original had on the readers in the source culture. The translator would not hinder the reader's comprehension by using absolute expressions in order to achieve equivalent effect.

Disadvantages

A weakness in meaning based translations is that they often sacrifice the flavor of the original culture for the sake of clarity and naturalness in the receptor language. The more dependent we are upon the judgment of scholars about what a Biblical writer meant, the more at risk we may be to mistranslate or misinterpret. The greater degree of deviation inevitably reflects a higher proportion of interpretation on the part of the translator.

1. 我的脚也没有偏离你的路。(诗篇 44: 18 CUV)

我也没有反抗你的命令。(诗篇 44: 18 TCV)

2. 使我的脚立在磐石上，使我的脚步稳当。(诗篇 40: 2 CUV)

他把我安置在磐石上，使我安全稳当。(诗篇 40: 2 TCV)

3. As indeed he says in another passage, 'You will not allow your faithful servant to rot in the grave.' (ACTS 13:35 TEV)

在另一处，诗篇的作者也说：你不会容许你忠心的仆人腐烂。(使徒行传 13: 35 TCV)

4. Look, you scoffers! Be astonished and die! For what I am doing today is something that you will not believe, even when someone explains it to you!" (ACTS 13:41 TEV)

藐视上帝的人哪，瞧吧，你们要惊骇，要死亡！因为我在你们的时代所做的事，即使有人向你们说明，你们总是不信！”(使徒行传 13: 41 TCV)

CUV	TCV
负重 <u>轭</u> ，作苦工	你父亲所罗门使我们背负 <u>重担</u>
必从你颈项挣开他的 <u>轭</u>	你将摆脱他的 <u>枷锁</u>
他施	远方
他施船只	远航船只 / 大船
他施的船只	在海洋上的水手们
巡抚	总督
使徒脚前	交给使徒

In the above examples, using the dynamic equivalence, translators were free to use more readable expressions instead of being forced to reproduce the Bible idiom. The disadvantage of dynamic translation is that there is a price to pay for readability. Dynamic translations lose precision because they omit subtle cues to the meaning of a passage that only literal translations preserve. They also run a greater risk of reading the translators' doctrinal views into the text because of the greater liberty so to how to render it.

4.4 The Summary

Translation equivalence is a key term in the translation theory, which is closely related to some prevalent definitions and criteria of translation. Thus, to investigate this concept is of vital importance for translation study and translation practice.

A concept is demonstrated by the analyses of three different Bible versions, showing that translation equivalence has a strong denotation of absoluteness, though in translation practice, it is relative rather than absolute. This relativity becomes most typical when the two sub-types of formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence are in conflict with each other. Relationship

between the two, however, is not a hierarchical one, as in different communicative situations, any one of them may be preferred over the other. The criterion that a translation should have an equivalence relation with the source language text is problematic. All translators agree that the translation should reflect faithfully the message of the original, but all are not agreed on whether the translation should adhere closely to the grammatical forms of the original language. Of course, going too far toward either extreme will cause trouble. A translation that is too formally equivalent can be very confusing and stilted. On the other hand, a translation that is too functionally equivalent can be even worse, because an author's general point is easily misinterpreted.

Since the translation equivalence is essentially relative both in quality and in quantity, an improved definition may be given as follows: translation is an interlingual source-text induced production of relatively equivalent target texts to serve a given readership's special need.

4.5 Dialectic Relationship between Translation Standards Based on the MCTC

Generally speaking, the multiplicity and complementary of translation system has reflected such dialectic laws as the unity of opposites, the negation of negation, and conversion between quality and quantity. From absolute standard to the highest standard, translation standard has experienced a process of conversion between quality and quantity. This conversion includes two factors: the affirmative one and negative one. The affirmative one lies in the fact that the highest standard affirms the absolute standard because the highest standard must be close to the absolute standard to the great extent, while the negative one that these two standards cannot be held coinciding with each other exactly, or not a word has been translated at all.”(最高标准对绝对标准的肯定因素在于它必须尽可能近似于绝对标准,其否定因素则在于它绝对不能与绝对标准(原作)重合,否则就等于一字不译。)(辜正坤, 2004:350) As for the relationship between the highest standard and concrete standards, essentially, the latter are the substantial form of the former, and they must be guided and governed by the highest standard. However, in some respects, the highest standard and concrete standards are contradictory to each other because “a single concrete standard can never reach the standard

of optimum closeness completely”. (一个单独的具体标准永远不可能完全达到最佳近似度这个标准。)(辜正坤, 2004:350) A single concrete standard, however, can only reach the highest standard in one or some aspects. As a result, the negative factor lies in the fact that a single concrete standard couldn't reach the highest standard in some aspects. Then concrete standards negate the absolute standard, since there are numerous concrete standards while there is only one absolute standard. If the numerous concrete standards are put together, they become the diversified form of absolute standard, and this can be regarded as the affirmative factor in their relationship.

To be more exact, the elements in the translation standard system are related and complementary to each other. The whole translation study history can prove that the optimum closeness depends on the specific situation. In other words, we must take changing view of the standard of optimum closeness, which is not a denial of the highest standard, but an emphasis on the hyper-space of thinking as well as the function of the thinking subject.

Hence it is understandable that the status of different concrete standards in the whole standard system is changeable. Gu states, “in the long river of the whole translation history, the stability of various translation standards are rather relative, and it is absolute that translation standards are changing all the time.”

4.6 The Strategies to Solve Problems

As has been mentioned above, problems of equivalence occur at various levels, and the present Chinese Bible versions have too much inadequacy that misleads the readers' understanding. To conform to the multiplicity and complementary of translation criteria, structural adjustment in translation is inevitably needed. These possibilities are expanded below.

1. Transparency to the original

It is important to remember that the Bible is not a simple book and that nowhere does it imply that it is immediately and easily understandable to every reader or listener. If we then look at the actual sayings of Jesus, it is obvious that the scriptures do not carry all of the

meaning on the surface. They require pondering and interpretation and mulling over. They are close relatives of the riddle.

2. Preserving the full interpretive potential of the original

An essentially multicomponent translation seeks to preserve the following:

- Language as beautiful and sophisticated as the original itself possesses
- As many levels of meaning as the original contains
- Poetry in its original, literal expression
- The stylistic range of the original
- Theological terminology as complex as the original contains

2. Not mixing commentary with translation

An essentially multicomponent translation operates on the premise that a translator is a steward of what someone else has written, not an editor or an exegete who needs to explain or correct what someone else has written.

3. Preserving what the biblical writers wrote actually

A multicomponent translation can pass on interpretive difficulties to the reader. The goal is to know what the original authors said.

4. Preserving the literary qualities of the Bible

The Bible in its original is a very literary book. It was the figurative language, and an essentially multicomponent translation preserves that figurative language.

5. Consistency with the doctrine of inspiration

Such a translation believes that the very words of the Bible are inspired and therefore inviolable. Throughout the Bible, Scripture is referred to as the word of God, not the thoughts of God.

4.7 Concerning translation principles

1. To translate the Scriptures accurately, without loss, change, distortion or embellishment of the meaning of the original text. Accuracy in Bible translation is the faithful communication, as exactly as possible, of that meaning, determined according to sound principles of exegesis.

2. To communicate not only the informational content, but also the feelings and attitudes of the original text. The flavor and impact of the original should be re-expressed in forms that are consistent with normal usage in the receptor language.

3. To preserve the variety of the original. The literary forms employed in the original text, such as poetry, prophecy, narrative and exhortation, should be represented by corresponding forms with the same communicative functions in the receptor language. The impact, interest, and mnemonic value of the original should be retained to the greatest extent possible.

4. To represent faithfully the original historical and cultural context. Historical facts and events should be expressed without distortion. At the same time the translation should be done in such a way that the receptor audience, despite differences of situation and culture, may understand the message that the original author was seeking to communicate to the original audience.

5. To make every effort to ensure that no contemporary political, ideological, social, cultural, or theological agenda is allowed to distort the translation.

6. To recognize that it is sometimes necessary to restructure the form of a text in order to achieve accuracy and maximal comprehension. Since grammatical categories and syntactic structures often do not correspond between different languages, it is often impossible or misleading to maintain the same form as the source text. Changes of form will also often be necessary when translating figurative language. A translation will employ as many or as few terms as are required to communicate the original meaning as accurately as possible.

7. To use the most reliable original language Scripture texts as the basis for translation, recognizing that these are always the primary authority. However, reliable Bible translations

in other languages may be used as intermediary source texts.

4.8 Concerning translation procedures

1. To determine, after careful linguistic and sociolinguistic research, the specific target audience for the translation and the kind of translation appropriate to that audience. It is recognized that different kinds of translation into a given language may be valid, depending on the local situation, including, for example, both more formal translations and common language translations.
2. To recognize that the transfer into the receptor language should be done by trained and competent translators who are translating into their mother tongue. Where this is not possible, mother-tongue speakers should be involved to the greatest extent possible in the translation process.
3. To give high priority to training mother-tongue speakers of the receptor language in translation principles and practice and to providing appropriate professional support.
4. To test the translation as extensively as possible in the receptor community to ensure that it communicates accurately, clearly and naturally, keeping in mind the sensitivities and experience of the receptor audience.
5. To choose the media for the translation that are most appropriate for the specific target audience, whether audio, visual, electronic, print, or a combination of these. This may involve making adjustments of form that are appropriate to the medium and to the cultural setting, while ensuring that the translated message remains faithful to the original message.
6. To encourage the periodic review of translations to ascertain when revision or a new translation is needed.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

By comparing MCTC with traditional translation theories, we don't intend to prove how inferior traditional translation standards are to MCTC, but to prove that with this comparative study we can have a more adequate understanding of the advantages of MCTC. First, Professor Gu has assimilated the essence of the concepts of traditional translation theories, and he has not only theorized those concepts but also proposed his own translation standard system. In this system, there is a hierarchy of concepts, ranging from absolute standard to the highest standard and to concrete standard. These concepts are well ordered and closely related to each other. Second, both MCTC and traditional translation theories emphasize the importance of original works. Professor Gu declares that the absolute standard is just a decoration because it is impossible for the translator to reach such a standard (i.e. just to copy the original works). On the one hand, he denies the objectivity of the term "faithfulness"; instead, he takes a multicompetent thinking pattern to inspect translation problems and recognizes the multiplicity of concrete translation standards which is actually a great breakthrough of the tradition.

What, then, makes a good Bible translation? In my opinion, a good translation will follow a balanced or mediating translation philosophy.

In conclusion, a good translation will follow a balanced or mediating translation philosophy, which is neither too much nor too little. It is neither too slavish a reproduction nor too free in its handling of the original. It is neither too casual, nor is it too formal. In a nutshell, the best translation is one that has avoided the extremes and has achieved the balance that will appeal to the most people for the longest period of time.

Translating the Bible is a never-ending task. As long as Chinese remains a living language, it will continue to change; therefore, new renderings of the scriptures will be

needed. Furthermore, as other ancient manuscripts come to light, scholars will need to evaluate the history of the transmission of the original texts.

Bibliography

《圣经》译本

- [1] Revised Version, 1885, A major British revision of KJV, of Tischendorf, Westcott-Hort etc.
- [2] Revised Standard Version, NT 1952 Division of Christian Education of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA.
- [3] 中国基督教协会:《圣经》(和合本·简体字), 南京, 1998.
- [4] 《圣经》(现代中文译本), 香港: 圣经公会, 1988.
- [5] 中文圣经新译会:《圣经》(新译本), 香港, 天道书楼有限公司, 1999

圣经翻译研究文献

- [1] Xiaochuan Ren: A Study of the Major English and Chinese Bible Versions throughout the History of Bible Translation [J], Asian Social Science, 2008.
- [2] Broomhall, Marshall: The Bible in China [M], San Francisco: Reprinted by Chinese Materials Center Inc, 1997.
- [3] The New International Version: Containing the Old Testament and the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, (1978).
- [4] The Modern Chinese Version. Hongkong: The International New Strength Publishing House. (1979).
- [5] Strandenaes, Thor. Principles of Chinese Bible Translation as Expressed in Five Selected Versions of the New Testament and Exemplified by Mt.5:1-12 and Col.1. Stockholm: Graphic Systems A B. 139 (1987).
- [6] Baker, M. 1992. In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. London: Sage Publication.
- [7] Bell, R.T. 1991. Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice. London: Longman.

- [8] Bassnett-McGuire, S. 1991. *Translation Studies*. New York: Methuen & Co. Ltd.
- [9] Catford, J.C. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Longman.
- [10] Hervey, S., Higgins, I., and Haywood, L. M. 1995. *Thinking Spanish Translation: A Course in Translation Method: Spanish into English*. London; New York: Routledge.
- [11] Koller, W. 1995. "The concept of equivalence and the object of translation studies". *Target*, 7 (2), 191-222.
- [12] Miao, J. 2000. "The limitations of equivalent effect". *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, Vol. 8. No. 3, 197-205.
- [13] Munday, J. 2001. *Introducing Translation Studies*. London; New York: Routledge.
- [14] Nababan, M.R. 2003. "Translation Processes, Practices and Products of Professional Indonesian Translators. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Schools of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand.
- [15] 1999. *Teori Menerjemah Bahasa Inggris*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- [16] 1989. "Analisis terjemahan buku *Research Methods and Analysis: Searching for Relationship* karya Michael H. Walizer dan Paul, W. Wienir ke dalam bahasa Indonesia oleh Sadiman dan Hutagaol". Unpublished Thesis. Surakarta: Universities Sebelas Maret.
- [17] Newmark, P.1991. *About Translation*. Great Britain: Longdunn Press, Ltd.
- [18] 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice-Hall International.
- [19] 1981. *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press
- [20] Nida, E. 1975. *Language Structure and Translation*. Standford, California: Stanford University Press.
- [21] 1964. *Towards a Science of Translating*. Leiden: Brill.
- [22] Vinay, J.P. and Darbelnet, J. 1965. *Stylistique Comparee du Francois et de L'angalis*. Paris: Didier.
- [23] 马乐梅: 《中文和合本圣经翻译原则之研究》, 西安: 陕西师范大学, 2001.
- [24] 庄柔玉: 《基督教圣经中文译本权威现象研究》, 香港:国际圣经协会, 2000.
- [25] Susan Bassnett,Andre Lefevere. *The Translation Turn in Cultural Studies*[C].上海:上海外语教育出版社,2001.

- [28] 方梦之.译学词典[K].上海:上海外语教育出版社,2004:9.
- [29] 陈义海.唐代景教的传教模式和译经模式研究[J].盐城师范学院学报:人文社会科学版,2004,(2):88-93.
- [30] 谢和耐.中国与基督教[M].上海:上海古籍出版社,2003.
- [31] 王晓朝.基督教与帝国文化[M].北京:东方出版社,1997:114.
- [32] 马祖毅.中国翻译简史——五四以前部分[M].北京:中国对外翻译出版公司,1984:182.
- [33] 海恩波.道在神州——圣经在中国的翻译与流传[M].蔡锦图,译.香港:国际圣经协会,2000:59.
- [34] 尤思德.和合本与中文圣经翻译[M].香港:国际圣经协会,2002:6.
- [35] 徐宗泽.明清间耶稣会士译著提要[M].上海:上海书店出版社,2006:15.
- [36] 何兆武,等,译.利马窦中国札记[M].北京:中华书局,1983.
- [37] Maria Tymoczko. Translation In A postcolonial Context:前言[M].上海:上海外语教育出版社,2004.
- [38] 赵维本.译经溯源——现代五大中文圣经翻译史[M].香港:中国神学研究院,1993.
- [39] 许牧世.经与译经[M].香港:香港文艺出版社,1983:3.
- [40] 许宝强,袁伟.语言与翻译的政治[C].北京:中央编译出版社,2001:173.
- [41] Hilaire Belloc. On Translation[M]. London: Oxford University press,1931:6.
- [42] 任东升:《圣经汉译文化研究》,湖北,湖北教育出版社,2007.
- [43] 辜正坤,《互构语言文化学原理》,北京:清华大学出版社,2004.
- [44] 许渊冲,《翻译的艺术》,北京:五洲传播出版社,2006.
- [45] 辜正坤.翻译标准多元互补论[J].中国翻译.1989(1)
- [46] 云楼.翻译理论的一点思考[J].中国翻译,1995,(5)

- [47] 杨自俭.译学新探[M].青岛:青岛出版社,2002 .
- [48] Daniell, David (2003). *The Bible in English: Its History and Influence*. Yale University Press, 1962.
- [49] Nida • A • Eugene(2004). *Towards a Science of Tanslating: with Special reference to Principles and Involved in Bible Translating*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- [50] 郭著章.(1999). 《当代美国翻译理论》[M]. 武汉：湖北教育出版社.